Utah Division of Radiation Control

NRC Activities

Utah Radiation Control Board Meeting November 13, 2012

- 1) 2 NRC Branch Technical Positions (BTP) [BTP = Guidance]
 - a) Concentration Averaging & Encapsulation
 - b) Import of Non-U.S. Origin Radioactive Sources
- 2) Draft NRC Rulemaking 10 CFR 61 Revisions Site-specific Analysis
- 3) Draft NRC Environmental Evaluation Blending LLRW Ion Exchange Resins

Draft Concentration Averaging & Encapsulation BTP, Rev. 1

- Published June 11, 2012 (Federal Register)
- Comment Period Closed October 8
- NRC reviewing and evaluating comments received
- Complete final BTP by mid-2013
- Provides guidance to waste generators on how to apply rule allowing averaging radionuclide concentrations
- Adds new section on "Alternative Approaches," to allow for site- and waste-specific approaches to be approved
- Incorporates more risk-informed / performance-based approach
- Rewritten to add additional clarification to existing BTP (1995)

Draft Concentration Averaging & Encapsulation BTP, Rev. 1

Comments

- NRC collaborative effort to engage stakeholders throughout the revision process
 - Post final BTP Importance of additional stakeholder meetings
 & Agreement State staff training
- Waste Acceptance Criteria (WAC)
 - Need to preserve existing waste classification tables
 - Potential for errors in waste packaging/classification in order to comply with disposal site's unique WAC
- Resource commitments to conduct review and evaluation of alternative approaches

Import of Non-US Origin Radioactive Sealed Sources BTP (Rev. 1)

- Published: October 22, 2012 (Federal Register)
- Comment Closes: December 21
- History: common for U.S. manufacturers to receive spent / disused sealed sources from foreign countries for recycle / disposal → 1:1 exchange
- **Proposal**: allow U.S. manufacturers to receive foreign source(s) even when its origin / point of use is unknown or uncertain based on good faith effort documentation
- DRC Review Status
 - DRC Comments, Working Draft submitted March 9
 - DRC Comments, Proposed BTP (no substantive change from working draft) – in process

NRC Draft Rules 10 CFR 61, Site-Specific Analysis Rulemaking

History:

- 2009: 2 Stakeholder Workshops 9/2/09 Bethesda, MD 9/23/09 SLC, UT *
- 2011: 1 Stakeholder Workshop Rockville, MD
- 2012: 3 Stakeholder Workshops
 - March 2 Phoenix, AZ *
 - May 15 Dallas, TX *
 - July 19 Rockville, MD *

Schedule:

- Draft proposed rule public comment: mid-Dec. 2012
- Proposed rule submitted to Commission: July 2013
- Final rule: July 2014

^{*} DRC staff participated, in person or by webinar

- October, 2011 NRC Preliminary Draft
 - Sent to Agreement States
- January 19, 2012 Commission Direction
 - 1) Flexibility to use modern ICRP dose methodology
 - 2) 2 tiered approach
 - Tier 1: Compliance Period "reasonably foreseeable future"
 - o Tier 2: Performance Period something longer
 - 3) Waste Acceptance Criteria (WAC) Flexibility
 - o Disposal site criteria:
 - Performance Assessment (PA) Model
 - Inadvertent Intruder Analysis, and
 - WAC

To determine how generator classifies LLRW (DOE Approach)

- 4) Rule Compatibility
 - Ensure alignment with States / provide flexibility

- Considerations Period of Performance (POP) for use in Performance Assessment (PA) Models
 - Short-lived isotopes (e.g., T_{1/2} < 50 yrs, e.g. Cs-137)
 - POP: 500-1,000 yrs.
 - Long-Lived Isotopes (w/ decreased progeny risk)
 - T1/2 \geq 50 yrs.
 - POP: 10,000 yrs.
 - Depleted Uranium (DU) (w/ increased progeny risk)
 - POP: ≥ 10,000 yrs. (existing Utah rule)

- Considerations:
 - 1) No NRC LLRW classification limits for Ra-226 (CwRa-226)
 - 2) All Host States <u>have</u> CwRa-226 limits (SC, TX, **UT**, WA)

```
o Class A Limits: CwRa-226 < 10,000 pCi/gm
```

- Class C Limits: 10,000 < CwRa-226 < 100,000 pCi/gm
- o Greater than Class C (GTCC) Limits: $C_{WRa-226} > 100,000 \text{ pCi/gm}$

Why Important?

- a) Naturally Occurring Uranium = U-238, U-234, U-235
- b) Serial Decay:

```
U-238 →Th-234 →Pa-234 →U-234 →Th-230 →Ra-226 →Rn-222
```

- Considerations Proposed Institutional Control Period
 - Some stakeholders asked for increase > 100 years
 - Impacts: Class definitionsInadvertent intruder analysis / assumptions
- Considerations Waste Acceptance Criteria
 - More confusion for LLRW generators
 - More burden on Host States (SC, TX, UT, WA)
 - NRC must preserve existing LLRW classification system

- Considerations Waste Acceptance Criteria
 - More confusion for LLRW generators
 - More burden on Host States (SC, TX, UT, WA)
 - NRC must preserve existing LLRW classification system
- Considerations Continued Public and Stakeholder involvement
 - NRC sponsored in sited states

NRC Draft Evaluation:

Alternatives for Handling LLRW Nuclear Power Plant (NPP) Spent Ion Exchange Resins (SIER)

- Published September 20, 2012 (Federal Register)
- Comment Closes January 18, 2013
- Originated from January 2010 Blending Workshop
 - Stakeholders interested in environmental impacts of LLW blending
- Staff included this evaluation in its recommended Option (#2) in SECY-10-0043

NRC Draft Evaluation: SIER Alternatives - cont'd

- Disposal Alternatives:
 - Alternative 1A: mechanical mixing
 - Blend Class A, B, C → Class A → disposal
 - Alternative 1B: pyrolysis, superheated steam (PSS)
 - Blend Class A, B, C → Class A → disposal
 - Alternative 2: no blending / no storage
 - Class A, B, and C ___ direct disposal
 - Alternative 3: storage / disposal
 - Class A
 direct disposal @ LLRW site (A)
 - Class B,C → long term NPP storage (20 yr), then B-C disposal

NRC Draft Evaluation: SIER Alternatives - cont'd

- Disposal Alternatives cont'd
 - Alternative 4A: PSS / Volume Reduction (VR)
 - Class A → direct disposal @ LLRW site (A)
 - Class B,C → PSS / VR (5:1), long term storage
 @ central site, then B-C disposal
 - Alternative 4B: PSS / VR

 - Class B,C

 direct B-C disposal (no storage)
- DRC Review now in process